

1 **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

2
3 **October 25, 2000**

4
5
6 **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Dan Maks called the meeting to order at
7 7:03 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council
8 Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

9
10 **ROLL CALL:** Present were Chairman Dan Maks, Planning
11 Commissioners Bob Barnard, Sharon Dunham,
12 Brian Lynott and Vlad Voytilla. Planning
13 Commissioners Chuck Heckman and Eric Johansen
14 were excused.

15
16 Principal Planner Hal Bergsma, Senior Planner
17 Barbara Fryer, AICP, and Recording Secretary
18 Sandra Pearson represented staff.

19
20
21
22 The meeting was called to order by Chairman Maks, who presented the format for the
23 work session.

24
25 **VISITORS:**

26
27 Chairman Maks asked if there were any visitors in the audience wishing to address the
28 Commission on any non-agenda issue or item. There were none.

29
30 **STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:**

31
32 On question, staff indicated that there were no communications at this time.

33
34 **WORK SESSION:**

35
36 **A. MERLO STATION AREA PLAN**

37
38 Senior Planner Barbara Fryer briefly discussed the purpose of this work session
39 regarding the Merlo Station Area Plan. She discussed the history of this study,
40 which was initiated in 1999 with a series of grants, including an Oregon
41 Department of Transportation (ODOT) Transportation Growth Management
42 Funding Grant. She also discussed that the grant had been received for this
43 project and the scope of work. She mentioned that they had attempted to find a
44 way to accommodate some good uses and plan quality development. She
45 described the objectives of the plan, as follows:
46

- 1 1. Update the City of Beaverton's Comprehensive Plan and
2 Development Code to promote transit-oriented development near
3 the Merlo Light Rail Station, while supporting industrial,
4 institutional and park uses that are characteristic of the area.
5 [Knowing this area would be difficult to plan for, staff wanted to
6 find a way to accommodate some of those uses and to allow some
7 redevelopment];
8
- 9 2. Identify City zoning districts that are equivalent to County transit-
10 oriented zoning district in the project area. [Observing that the
11 area to the north will eventually annex to the City, staff wanted to
12 provide some equivalent translations, so that when the properties
13 are annexed, it would be possible to go through a new approved
14 process to allow annexations to occur more administratively];
15
- 16 3. Identify and adopt land use regulations and standards that will
17 guide new development within the station area. [A number of new
18 standards and land use regulations have been identified that staff
19 has anticipated would be implemented in the Development Code
20 subsequent to the Land Use Element Update];
21
- 22 4. Bring the City into compliance with Metro's Urban Growth
23 Management Functional Plan Requirements through adoption of
24 Comprehensive Plan and Development Code Amendments;
25
- 26 5. Maintain compliance with State Transportation Planning Rules
27 Sections 020, 045 and 060 by addressing multi-model system
28 through adoption of Comprehensive Plan and Development Code
29 Amendments at the close of this project; and
30
- 31 6. Adopt Comprehensive Plan and Development Code Amendments
32 that are likely to encourage increased transit use, carpooling,
33 walking and bicycling by those who travel to and from the Merlo
34 Light Rail Station Area.

35
36 Ms. Fryer mentioned that this particular grant is intended to increase the intensity
37 of land uses in this area, while maintaining some functionality in terms of the
38 industrial-type uses that have few options for locating throughout the City. She
39 commented ODOT, which is providing the funding for this particular project,
40 distributed the request for proposals to consultants.

41
42 Principal Planner Hal Bergsma mentioned communications from Tri-Met,
43 Tualatin Hills Park and Recreation District (THPRD) and the Beaverton School
44 District. On question, he was assured that the Planning Commissioners had the
45 opportunity to review these communications. Observing that there is a time
46 constraint and the grant money runs out in June 2001, he stated that while the City

1 of Beaverton could continue to work on this project after that time, any work after
2 that point can not be billed to the grant funds. He mentioned that this is the last
3 area where there has been no consideration given to any changes in the plan in
4 recognition of the light rail in this area. Observing that Washington County had
5 done a great deal of planning in the Merlo Road area and the area north of Jenkins
6 Road, including the Sequent property, he mentioned that this work had been
7 completed in 1997. He discussed significant work in the downtown station areas,
8 as well as the Beaverton Creek and Millikan Way station areas. Observing that
9 there is no predetermined outcome for the Merlo Road Station area, he
10 commented that staff would attempt to accomplish as much as possible by mid-
11 2001.

12
13 Observing that periodic review is required every five to seven years, Chairman
14 Maks pointed out that it takes five to seven years to complete.

15
16 Mr. Bergsma agreed that periodic review is a continual process.

17
18 Chairman Maks requested clarification of whether staff is looking for direction
19 from the Planning Commission at this time.

20
21 Ms. Fryer advised Chairman Maks that staff is requesting input of how the
22 Planning Commissioners feel about the specific policy choices identified in
23 Technical Report No. 2 and the different alternatives. She commented that based
24 upon this information and comments submitted through the letters and different
25 meetings, staff would like to combine the alternatives to create a preferred
26 alternative. She clarified that staff is not recommending any particular alternative
27 at this time, adding that staff is attempting to get all the facts together in order to
28 create and present a preferred alternative in Comprehensive Plan and
29 Development Code language.

30
31 Chairman Maks agreed with Ms. Fryer's strategy, observing that he would like to
32 receive public testimony regarding this issue this evening.

33
34 **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

35
36 **JIM LYNCH**, representing the Beaverton School District, responded to the
37 requests from October 4, 2000, stating that the letter that he had submitted had
38 been an attempt to clarify what he considers fundamental issues with this plan.
39 He pointed out that the Stakeholders Meeting had presented some very good
40 discussion that he would like to share, adding that he feels that the City of
41 Beaverton has a good team and he appreciates their efforts.

42
43 Mr. Lynch discussed the policy choices, noting that he had not responded to this
44 issue in his letter. He mentioned the necessity of establishing goals and objectives
45 prior to determining policies, practices and implementation actions, which he
46 referred to as tools that allow the system to function properly.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

Mr. Lynch referred to the Merlo Station Area Plan Technical Report No. 2, Chapter 3 -- Policy Approaches and Choices. He expressed his support of the first paragraph, which states that "the City needs to decide if this area should become a true station community, as defined by Metro and by the Transportation Rule, or more of an employment center." He expressed his opinion that this has not yet been addressed. He discussed the Policy Choices, as follows:

1. *Should residential uses be allowed anywhere?* He expressed his opinion that something is out of sequence here, observing that a vision should be available in order to establish policies to support the direction, which should have been determined.
2. *How intensely should the property nearest the Merlo Light Rail Transit (LRT) station be developed?* He questioned whether it has yet been determined that there should be higher density office commercial uses. He commented that he has yet to see any documentation that supports a conclusion to that effect, emphasizing his earlier statement that something appears to be out of sequence.
3. *What type of low intensity requirements should be allowed, if any and should there be a minimum number of employees per acre required?* He commented on the minimum number of employees per acre, observing that based on the current ownerships and considering all of the property that each entity owns, at approximately 27 employees per acre, PGE has the highest employee per acre ratio of the properties within the plan area. He noted that at approximately 25 employees per acre, the Beaverton School District has the second highest ratio of employees per acre, while Tri-Met's ratio is approximately nine employees per acre. He expressed his opinion that because Tri-Met is actually located closest to the station area, there should be a greater pressure for Tri-Met to actually establish a minimum density or employee per acreage ratio.
4. *Should there be a reduction in the minimum required parking requirements within close proximity of the Merlo LRT station?* He expressed his opinion that this does not necessarily serve any purpose. He pointed out that school district employees require the flexibility to travel between the 45 separate district locations, emphasizing that public transportation will never be adequate for these purposes, or to provide transportation for the continual teacher training which is scheduled throughout most of the year.

- 1 5. *How easy should it be for employees to access the entrance to the*
2 *park located at the south end of the Beaverton School District*
3 *property?* Observing that this relates to access to THPRD's Nature
4 Park, specifically through school district property, he noted that his
5 only concern is an issue of potential security. Observing that some
6 might refer to the administrative building as an architectural
7 wonder, while others might call it a rat's maze, he described this
8 long and narrow building, which stretches perpendicular from the
9 street. Referring to the data center on south end of the building, he
10 observed that this stores very confidential information and that any
11 compromise to this security would present a major issue.
12
- 13 6. *Should SW Merlo Road be designed to remain at three lanes wide,*
14 *with pedestrian amenities such as wider sidewalks, benches and*
15 *street trees, even if it causes a higher level of congestion?* He
16 mentioned that his preference is for this road to remain at three
17 lanes, adding that turn arrows in the center turn lane would be an
18 improvement. He commented that he would also support a four-
19 way intersection to serve school district, Tri-Met and Unified
20 Sewerage Agency (USA), which would create a significantly safer
21 condition than that which currently exists.
22
- 23 7. *What uses and design standards are most appropriate for the area*
24 *bordering the Nature Park?* He mentioned specific suggestions on
25 an approach to create special standards for the southern portions of
26 the property that abut the northern edge of the nature park. He
27 referred to the 30-foot wide right-of-way that actually abuts all of
28 Tri-Met's southerly property line and nearly all of the Beaverton
29 School District's southern property line. Observing that this 30-
30 foot creates a quite reasonable buffer, he suggested that it could
31 serve some other type of function as well. He suggested that if it
32 were vacated, the storm water quality treatment could possibly
33 occur in a swale along that 30-foot buffer, expressing his opinion
34 that a fairly substantial volume could be contained.
35
- 36 8. *What percentage of landscaping should be required for new*
37 *development within the study area?* Observing that the standard is
38 15%, he expressed his opinion that nothing less than 10% would be
39 acceptable.
40
- 41 9. *Should Beaverton allow commercial alleyways or narrow street*
42 *connections to serve internal traffic?* Expressing his opinion that
43 this is an interesting concept and a reasonable idea, he emphasized
44 that this obviously depends upon which plan might be developed
45 and security issues imposed upon individual properties. He

1 discouraged adoption until an acceptable vision and concept plan
2 has been developed.

3
4 10. *Should the City impose design standards, either through a Design*
5 *Review Board with broad discretionary authority (like now) or*
6 *through adoption of specific standards?* He responded that these
7 types of things should be an outgrowth of the vision of the
8 development of a particular area.

9
10 11. *How can the City mandate shared parking, or at least access*
11 *across properties?* He expressed concern with potential security
12 issues, adding that this could only be accomplished through the
13 development of a truly Comprehensive Plan. He emphasized that
14 this would require the participation and cooperation of everyone
15 involved, adding that mandated shared parking could create issues
16 involving security. He expressed his preference to utilizing
17 incentives, rather than mandates, to encourage change.

18
19 Mr. Lynch referenced a portion of Chapter 3, which is entitled "The Case for
20 Making a Change", as follows: "The future land uses within the study should not
21 stay the same over the long term. The current zone allows the following uses,
22 which the City should, instead, discourage or prohibit." He expressed his opinion
23 that these comments are stated as conclusions, rather than recommendations.
24 Concluding, he emphasized that no conclusion by any careful and thoughtful
25 analysis has indicated that this study area should not remain the same.

26
27 Chairman Maks referred to Mr. Lynch's letter, commenting that this letter
28 basically suggests a meeting of a representative grouping of stakeholders to
29 determine what is acceptable and what is not acceptable.

30
31 Mr. Lynch clarified that Chairman Maks had correctly identified his ideas for
32 addressing these issues.

33
34 Chairman Maks referred to Mr. Lynch's comments regarding the policies,
35 specifically Policy Choice No. 3, adding that he had not addressed the proposed
36 prohibition on outdoor storage/warehousing, specifically the effect on the
37 Beaverton School District.

38
39 Mr. Lynch noted that the maintenance yard is currently located on part of this
40 property, adding that this facility serves any maintenance for the entire district.
41 Observing that neither the City of Beaverton nor the portions of Washington
42 County served by the Beaverton School District has much land available zoned to
43 allow such purposes, he emphasized that the district is committed to serve and
44 maintain over sixty buildings. He pointed out that it is necessary to have room to
45 store both vehicles and materials necessary to provide this service.

46

1 Chairman Maks referred to Policy Choice No. 2, regarding the floor area ratio
2 (FAR), specifically the number of employees per acre. He observed that he is
3 aware of certain administrative functions at different schools that would be better
4 located at the main building, he pointed out that this facility is unable to
5 accommodate all of these functions.

6
7 Mr. Lynch agreed that this is a difficult situation, noting that while FARs provide
8 a good sort of conceptual planning tool for new development, they are not as
9 realistic or effective in redevelopment. He emphasized that this tool creates a real
10 dilemma for normal growth and expansion of facilities, pointing out that it is
11 unfortunate that that it is unlikely that funding would ever be available to tear
12 down this building and start from scratch. He pointed out that while a number
13 one priority is to invest available funding into the buildings, replacement of the
14 central administration facilities involves a long-term project.

15
16 Chairman Maks referred to Mr. Lynch's comments regarding mandated versus
17 incentive shared parking, adding that as a result of his frustrating experience with
18 the shared parking of THPRD and Southridge High School, he no longer supports
19 this concept.

20
21 Commissioner Voytilla questioned Mr. Lynch whether any location exists within
22 the City of Beaverton that would serve the needs of the Beaverton School District
23 to replace their facilities, under the assumption that funding is not an issue. He
24 observed that he is referring to an already-existing structure or land available for
25 the construction of an appropriate structure.

26
27 Pointing out that he is not actually familiar with the market, Mr. Lynch noted that
28 as far as bare land is concerned, it would present a real challenge to find land that
29 would satisfy current needs as well as projected long-term needs. He mentioned
30 that it might be necessary to double the central administration and maintenance-
31 type functions in their capacity to provide service over the long term.

32
33 Chairman Maks questioned the storage of buses on this particular site.

34
35 Mr. Lynch advised Chairman Maks that it is not anticipated that buses would be
36 stored on this site.

37
38 Commissioner Voytilla questioned the efficiency of the current location versus
39 another potential location.

40
41 Mr. Lynch informed Commissioner Voytilla that an alternate location could quite
42 possibly be less efficient, pointing out that this site is located almost in the
43 geographic service center for the school district. He observed that following
44 potential annexations, it could possibly be located in the center of the City of
45 Beaverton as well.

46

1 Commissioner Voytilla referred to Metro 2040, specifically the impacts for the
2 district to provide adequate continuing service.

3

4 Observing that this is a difficult question, Mr. Lynch stated that it involves a great
5 deal of speculation. He pointed out that it is his understanding that 2040 has
6 specific goals and targets, adding that if they evolve, the result would be some
7 fairly significant densification of areas that are currently of lower density. He
8 advised that this would impact the enrollment in the central portion of the district,
9 where there are literally no areas available on which to build additional schools or
10 expand existing schools.

11

12 Commissioner Voytilla questioned the status of the long-range planning for the
13 Beaverton School District.

14

15 Mr. Lynch informed Commissioner Voytilla that satellite sites in a central
16 organization are very troublesome, pointing out that one of the functional
17 objectives is those who impact the areas served must integrate their activities very
18 closely. To not have that physical adjacency begins to severely impact the
19 amount and quality of interaction that occurs between these individuals.

20

21 Commissioner Voytilla suggested the intensification of the utilization of the
22 current site.

23

24 Mr. Lynch agreed that it is necessary to intensify the use of this site.

25

26 Expressing appreciation of his comments, Chairman Maks referred to Mr. Lynch's
27 sticky notes and suggested that he might be willing to serve on the Planning
28 Commission.

29

30 Mr. Lynch advised Chairman Maks that as a resident of the City of Portland, he is
31 not able to serve in this capacity.

32

33 **MICHAEL KISER**, representing Tri-Met, expressed support of this process. He
34 noted that as a land developer for Tri-Met, he has been working with Mr.
35 Bergsma and Ms. Fryer, who have, in his opinion, been very receptive to the
36 stakeholders and others involved with the process. He expressed his opinion that
37 this particular area is very difficult to deal with, adding that it also has the
38 potential to become a unique station area. He mentioned that there are many
39 difficult issues involving public or quasi-public agencies existing in the area,
40 pointing out that Tri-Met realizes that their particular use is not transit-supportive
41 at this station, although it was there before the idea of the light rail was even
42 conceived. Referring to the necessity of maintaining the vitality of this facility,
43 he pointed out that there might be a potential to offset some of these impacts.

44

45 Mr. Kiser discussed potential areas of transit-oriented development (TOD),
46 referring to everything north of the proposed road that would extend from the
intersection at Merlo Road and Merlo Drive down into the Tri-Met site. He

1 displayed an illustration of Alternative No. 2 and described how Tri-Met's site
2 might develop. Observing that Tri-Met's comments did not go through each of
3 the policies, he referred to this as a work in progress, adding that much of the
4 language is the consultant's. He stated that he had focussed more on the desired
5 end result and how this could be achieved.

6
7 Mr. Kiser discussed the potential to turn Tri-Met's existing use into non-
8 conforming use, adding that this creates problems with the transitioning issue. He
9 mentioned that Tri-Met is currently working with USA in an effort to sell five of
10 their thirty acres of land. He pointed out that there are significant on-site storm
11 water issues, adding that impacts are being transferred to the nature park to the
12 south of the site. He commented that Tri-met is receptive to the concept of
13 working with other landowners in the area to facilitate some type of joint-use in
14 the TOD area. In their transitioning process, Tri-Met eventually may consider
15 moving an administrative building up into the TOD area as part of some type of a
16 condo-type arrangement, including a vertical mixed-use of office, supporting
17 retail, day care and shared parking. He emphasized that he does not foresee
18 moving off of the current site in the near future, noting that this while this site is
19 not particularly convenient, Tri-Met gains their efficiency through its other sites.
20 He observed that he wears two hats at Tri-Met, adding that he serves the TOD
21 Director and also works heavily in Facility Planning.

22
23 Chairman Maks requested clarification of whether Mr. Kiser is concerned with
24 the possibility that Tri-Met's facility might become a non-conforming use.

25
26 Mr. Kiser confirmed his concern with non-conforming use status.

27
28 Chairman Maks questioned Mr. Kiser's position on whether Merlo Road should
29 be three lanes or five lanes.

30
31 Mr. Kiser commented that three lanes are preferred, pointing out that five lanes
32 does nothing to promote transit-oriented development. He noted that he is
33 pushing to obtain a traffic signal at the intersection of Merlo Drive and Merlo
34 Road, which he feels will help to facilitate crossing in that area. He mentioned
35 that smaller block sizes help facilitate better connections for pedestrians.

36
37 Commissioner Voytilla questioned whether Mr. Kiser envisions Tri-Met as the
38 developer of TOD.

39
40 Mr. Kiser advised Commissioner Voytilla that in the event of joint-development
41 opportunities, Tri-Met generally locates a developer to facilitate the development,
42 adding that eventually they sell off the land to the developer, but in the interest of
43 a good design, they maintain their involvement.

44
45 Commissioner Voytilla referred to 2040, specifically how Tri-Met's facility would
46 change to meet those challenges.

1 Mr. Kiser pointed out that as the area grows, the current site would become more
2 of a central area.

3

4 Commissioner Voytilla suggested that the emphasis on public transportation
5 would create a greater need for buses, questioning how to physically provide
6 additional buses without increasing storage facilities.

7

8 Mr. Kiser advised Commissioner Voytilla that it would become necessary for Tri-
9 Met to become more innovative with how they structure available facilities or
10 locate additional facilities.

11

12 Observing that 2040 will occur in less than 40 years, Commissioner Voytilla
13 pointed out that it is not feasible to wait until 2030 or even 2020 and questioned
14 whether Tri-Met is experiencing funding constraints.

15

16 Mr. Kiser noted that structured parking is expensive and more difficult to
17 facilitate.

18

19 Commissioner Barnard expressed his appreciation of Mr. Kiser's efforts and
20 informed him that he is either geometrically or geographically challenged.

21

22 Chairman Maks cautioned Mr. Kiser that Commissioner Barnard is challenged.

23

24 Commissioner Dunham advised Commissioner Barnard that the concept to which
25 he is referring is geometrically challenged.

26

27 Observing that he is struggling with the shape of the study area and the location
28 related to the station, Commissioner Barnard noted that he would like to take
29 compass, place the sharp end on the station and spin a circle, which would be the
30 station community. He questioned the method for determining the location of the
31 light rail stations.

32

33 Mr. Kiser advised Commissioner Barnard that many of the stations were based on
34 the potential to create the type of station area planning that was desirable rather
35 than going through an existing urban area. He observed that most of the stations
36 reflect that concept, particularly in the west side, with the exception of the
37 Elmonica Station, which has to be in that location due to speeds and the ability to
38 turn off at that site.

39

40 Commissioner Barnard questioned whether the Merlo Station was located because
41 Tri-Met owns the adjacent property.

42

43 Mr. Kiser advised Commissioner Barnard that it is unlikely that the Merlo Station
44 is in that location because Tri-Met owns the adjacent property, observing that this
45 is not an ideal location. He pointed out that nothing is gained by locating the
46 buses right at the light rail station and that this site does not serve a high

1 administrative function. He noted that other factors most likely determined the
2 location of this site, emphasizing that the while this is not a good location from a
3 land use perspective, Tri-Met wants it there from a facility perspective. He
4 concluded that these goals could not be achieved without some compromise.

5
6 Observing that he is familiar with and utilizes the Elmonica Station,
7 Commissioner Barnard questioned what Mr. Kiser anticipates the situation at the
8 Merlo Station would be in the year 2040.

9
10 Mr. Kiser advised Commissioner Barnard that he anticipates some high density
11 pedestrian oriented TODs, adding that this would most likely be employment-
12 based. He added that without other partnerships involved which could precipitate
13 their relocation, he expects that the Tri-Met facility would still be in that location,
14 in some capacity.

15
16 Commissioner Barnard questioned whether Mr. Kiser anticipates any type of
17 housing and employment mix in this area.

18
19 Mr. Kiser stated that given the buses, it is difficult to envision housing, although it
20 might be a possibility up close to station if the uses were buffered from the bus
21 operations by other buildings. He commented that while this could be a desirable
22 area for housing due to the close proximity to the nature park, the necessary
23 residential amenities are not available.

24
25 Commissioner Dunham expressed concern with what she perceives as a lack of
26 use of the Merlo Station. She pointed out that with more parking available, the
27 Elmonica Station area is more feasible for residential use, and expressed her
28 opinion that most people would not be expecting residential use in the Merlo
29 Station area.

30
31 Mr. Kiser suggested the possibility of creating a more focussed employment
32 center, pointing out that Reser's Foods could potentially utilize the Merlo Station.
33 He emphasized that he does not prefer to have the bus maintenance facility
34 located at the transit station.

35
36 Observing that the Beaverton School District and Tri-Met are the two major
37 stakeholders that showed up, Commissioner Dunham pointed out that the
38 scenarios that have been presented could provide a great catalyst for planning
39 strategies and discussions. She emphasized that it is necessary for the planners,
40 stakeholders and others with a vested interest to take the opportunity to meet and
41 discuss the entire vision, adding that this is not likely to be resolved in one
42 session.

43 Mr. Kiser pointed out that it is difficult to make the entire process evolve
44 correctly in terms of pace, emphasizing that some of these entities and
45 stakeholders might need to move more quickly than others.

46

1 Chairman Maks expressed appreciation of Mr. Kiser's testimony, which he felt
2 was open, honest, thoughtful and knowledgeable.

3

4 Observing that two of the four entities who had submitted communications
5 regarding the Merlo Station Area Plan are not represented at this time,
6 Commissioner Voytilla questioned whether Ms. Fryer could provide an update on
7 the positions of Washington County and THPRD.

8

9 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Voytilla that the communication from
10 Washington County is attached to the packets that have been distributed.

11

12 Commissioner Voytilla advised Ms. Fryer that he would like further clarification
13 of the comments from Washington County and THPRD.

14

15 Ms. Fryer noted that Washington County is concerned with the possible reduction
16 of Merlo Road from five lanes to three lanes. She pointed out that they consider
17 this facility a through street, rather than a station area, to move cars from 170th
18 Avenue, over to 158th Avenue and north to the freeway. She expressed her
19 opinion that additional study may be necessary in order to prove that the three-
20 lane facility might be feasible.

21

22 Mr. Bergsma observed that the Regional Transportation Plan does indicate that
23 this would be a five-lane facility. He noted that because the involved local
24 governments -- Washington County and the City of Beaverton would have to ask
25 Metro change their plan. He pointed out that this might be difficult, since Metro
26 just recently adopted this plan, adding that he would not be optimistic about either
27 Metro or Washington County reversing their position that Merlo Road should be a
28 five-lane facility.

29

30 Commissioner Voytilla questioned whether funding is available to pay for this
31 analysis from the grants that have been received.

32

33 Mr. Bergsma noted that the analysis that Washington County referred to appears
34 to involve access spacing and justifying spacing less than 600 feet apart and
35 advised Commissioner Voytilla that funding is not available to address these
36 issues.

37

38 Ms. Fryer observed that it is feasible to consider what types of street cross-
39 sections might be more beneficial for the process and to make recommendations
40 to both those processes. On question, she advised Commissioner Voytilla that she
41 has had contact with Mr. Crumpacker of Washington County regarding the
42 content of his letter, adding that he was receptive to different street designs.

43 Mr. Bergsma pointed out that Washington County has faced a similar issue in the
44 past in the Cedar Mill area with Cornell Road.

45

1 Commissioner Voytilla referred to the letter from THPRD, requesting
2 clarification of their comments regarding this issue.

3

4 Chairman Maks observed that THPRD had expressed concern with wildlife
5 crossings, right-hand turnouts and operating hours.

6

7 Mr. Bergsma noted that he had attended a meeting of the Nature Park Advisory
8 Committee where this matter was discussed, pointing out that some of the
9 comments are pretty difficult to address.

10

11 Chairman Maks requested clarification of what type of direction staff is
12 requesting.

13

14 Ms. Fryer pointed out that with any of the proposed alternatives, the bubbles don't
15 necessarily have to resemble the diagram, adding that they could be specifically
16 tailored and specialized to adapt to particular uses.

17

18 Chairman Maks mentioned that there is still a problem with disallowing some of
19 the current uses. He pointed out that these are public and quasi-public agencies,
20 emphasizing that there is no other available location for these facilities.

21

22 On question, Mr. Bergsma advised Chairman Maks that Statewide Goal 11
23 addresses public services.

24

25 Chairman Maks referred to Statewide Goal 11, emphasizing that the school
26 district is centrally located there for a specific reason. He stressed that a
27 maximum-parking ratio is not feasible, pointing out training at this facility
28 involves a large group of individuals. He mentioned that although they would
29 like to increase their employment base, this is not possible due to a lack of
30 funding.

31

32 Mr. Bergsma reminded Chairman Maks that Mr. Kiser had suggested the
33 possibility of applying two or three zones within this area.

34

35 Chairman Maks expressed his concern with the uses necessary on light industrial
36 land, particularly non-conforming uses. He pointed out that land can not be
37 created and that all land types need to be available. He suggested scrapping the
38 plan and getting all of the stakeholders together to determine their needs, adding
39 that it might be necessary to address Tri-Met's property and leave the other
40 property alone.

41

42 Mr. Bergsma advised Chairman Maks that his preference would be for staff and
43 the consultants to prepare some ideas that could address some of the comments
44 that have been received, adding that these ideas could then be discussed with the
45 stakeholders.

46

1 Chairman Maks discussed the various needs of Tri-Met and the Beaverton School
2 District. He discussed policy choices, emphasizing that he does not want any
3 residential use in this area and that he feels that any intense development should
4 basically be limited to the Tri-Met property. He noted that he has a problem with
5 the school district's use and functions, specifically the FAR, adding that outside
6 storage is also an issue. He pointed out that gas stations are not an issue, adding
7 that he has a major problem with the proposed reduction in the minimum parking
8 requirements. He mentioned that Policy Choice No. 5 is an issue that should be
9 determined strictly by THPRD, expressing his opinion that THPRD's comment
10 that access to the park needs to be paid for by the developer is ironic, since the
11 developer is paying taxes anyway. He expressed his appreciation of Mr.
12 Bergsma's comments regarding Policy Choice No. 6, specifically whether Merlo
13 Road should be three lanes or five lanes, emphasizing that he is in support of five
14 lanes for what is supposed to be a major truck route. He pointed out that it would
15 be difficult to make this area pedestrian friendly, even with three lanes. He
16 referred to Policy Choice No. 7, noting that design standards could be embodied
17 with regard to the nature park and emphasizing how excited he becomes over too
18 much glazed glass.

19
20 Ms. Fryer commented that the nature park also gets excited over too much glazed
21 glass.

22
23 Chairman Maks mentioned Policy Choice No. 8, observing that he would like
24 feedback on this issue from his fellow Commissioners.

25
26 Mr. Bergsma pointed out that Policy Choice No. 8 does not involve so much the
27 amount of landscaping, but the location of the landscaping within the site.

28
29 Chairman Maks agreed that a small amount of landscaping could be designed
30 with courtyards and open space amenities in a way that greatly enhances an area.
31 He referred to Policy Choice No. 9, which suggests consolidation of alleyways
32 linking properties in the area, emphasizing that he disagrees with the entire
33 concept. He expressed his agreement with Policy Choice No. 10. He expressed
34 his disagreement with Policy Choice No. 11, which mandates shared parking.
35 Concluding, he commented that if the goal is to create a greater ridership in this
36 area, he is not certain that these actions would have this effect. He pointed out
37 that a larger parking lot would most likely generate more ridership.

38
39 Mr. Bergsma observed that other opportunities and developments are likely to be
40 created that would likely generate more ridership.

41
42 Commissioner Voytilla expressed his agreement with Chairman Maks' comments,
43 adding that he has some different concerns with the policies. He expressed his
44 agreement with Commissioner Dunham's comments, requesting clarification of
45 some of the background information, specifically justification of the rationale of
46 the existence of this particular station at this specific location. He discussed what

1 he referred to as a genuine loss of efficiency, adding that he is concerned that
2 comments have not been received from other stakeholders. He observed that he
3 and his wife had discontinued use of Merlo Station because of problems with
4 access, emphasizing that it is nearly impossible to exit this area during peak hour
5 periods. He mentioned that while there is a bus stop located on the westbound
6 side of Merlo Road right at the light rail tracks, there is no safe pedestrian
7 crossing.

8
9 Commissioner Voytilla discussed Policy Choice No. 1, agreeing that there should
10 be no residential use in this area. He referred to Policy Choice No. 2, stating that
11 any intensity for TODs should be centered right within the Tri-Met site. He
12 mentioned Policy Choice No. 3, expressing his opinion that this should be kept
13 open at this time, expressing his opinion that no restrictions that might limit their
14 serviceability should be imposed upon these public facilities. He discussed Policy
15 Choice No. 4, expressing his disagreement with the proposed parking reduction.
16 He referred to Policy Choice No. 5, expressing his disagreement with Chairman
17 Maks and emphasizing his concern with safety and security issues. He discussed
18 Policy Choice No. 6, expressing his opinion that a study would bear out the three
19 lanes versus five lanes on Merlo Road. He discussed Policy Choice No. 7,
20 emphasizing that the nature park had been private property not too long ago and
21 expressing his opinion that any additional setback easements should come out of
22 the nature park property. He referred to Policy Choice No. 8, regarding the
23 percentage of landscaping, concurring with Chairman Maks' comments. He
24 expressed his opinion that percentages should not be determined at this time,
25 emphasizing that the issue is the quality, not the quantity, of the landscaping.

26
27 Chairman Maks suggested that the landscaping should be left at 15%, but creating
28 an allowance for the hardscape-type things that had been discussed. Observing
29 this would provide for one step further, he suggested the possibility of including
30 Board of Design Review criteria regarding the quality of the greenery.

31
32 Commissioner Voytilla agreed with Chairman Maks, pointing out a large amount
33 of bark dust does not provide a quality landscape and expressed his concern with
34 landscaping that is beneficial to birds and small mammals. He discussed Policy
35 Choice No. 9, pointing out that the users need to get together and agree on issues,
36 including security, maintenance, access and noise. He referred to Policy Choice
37 No. 10, expressing his opinion that design standards should not be imposed. He
38 discussed Policy Choice No. 11, adding that while incentives are a possibility,
39 shared parking is extremely difficult to implement successfully. He expressed
40 concern with the comments on page 30 of the report, specifically the first
41 paragraph which discusses the case for making a change. He emphasized that it is
42 necessary for the stakeholders to actively participate in this process, adding that it
43 might be counterproductive to the stakeholders to leave all of these issues up to
44 the consultants.

45

1 On question, Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Voytilla that staff had obtained a
2 copy of the school district's documentation for their long-range planning.

3

4 Commissioner Dunham stated that she is in agreement with most of what has
5 been said regarding policies. She discussed intensity and FARs, adding that she
6 disagrees with THPRD, expressing her opinion that more intensification belongs
7 by Merlo Station as it is. She discussed the reduction of parking requirements,
8 expressing her agreement that these requirements should not be reduced at this
9 time. She discussed entrance to the nature park, emphasizing that pedestrian
10 circulation is relevant to any design plan that has yet to be determined. She
11 mentioned Merlo Road, expressing her disagreement with Chairman Maks,
12 pointing out that she is in favor of three lanes. She discussed the Boulevard
13 design standards and expressed agreement with Commissioner Voytilla's
14 observation that the Nature Park had come after the existing uses and that any
15 setback should come out of the Nature Park property. She discussed commercial
16 alleyways, expressing her opinion that this would be related to the eventual
17 overall design concept. She referred to the issue of shared parking, specifically
18 whether the problems experience at Southridge High School are the exception or
19 the rule.

20

21 Chairman Maks advised Commissioner Dunham that while shared parking most
22 likely works in many situations, it is necessary to remember that this concept
23 generally works with two completely opposite end users. He observed that we are
24 working with land, rather than the users.

25

26 Commissioner Voytilla expressed his opinion that an opportunity for shared
27 parking might work in this particular situation.

28

29 Chairman Maks observed that the landowners are best able to determine the
30 feasibility of shared parking, emphasizing that these particular facilities have
31 limited options regarding their location.

32

33 Mr. Bergsma commented that one of the advantages of considering residential in
34 this area would be an opportunity for shared parking with other potential uses.

35

36 Commissioner Dunham pointed out that she agrees with the case for making the
37 change.

38

39 Commissioner Barnard noted that he agrees with Chairman Maks, pointing out
40 that it is necessary to focus on Tri-Met and their property. He mentioned that
41 development is the main cause of growth. He expressed his agreement with most
42 of the comments regarding the policy choices, with the exception of Policy
43 Choice No. 5, regarding use of the nature park, pointing out that he would use
44 public transportation to get there. He suggested that it would make sense to
45 provide a nice entrance to the park close to Merlo Station.

46

1 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Barnard that there is actually a nice entrance to
2 the nature park located at Merlo Station, adding that after exiting Max, it is
3 necessary to cross the tracks and turn east.

4
5 Commissioner Barnard noted that he has obviously not visited this nature park
6 and had not been aware of this entrance. He discussed the controversy over three
7 or five lanes on Merlo Road, pointing out that this reminds him of the episode of
8 *Seinfeld* where Seinfeld and Kramer are out painting their own lines on the
9 roadway. He mentioned mandates and incentives, observing that it is sometimes
10 necessary to consider reality, rather than what we would like, adding that adding
11 to the congestion will not necessarily encourage use of public transportation. He
12 pointed out that more congestion only causes people to use their horns, run over
13 pedestrians and shoot one another. He emphasized that if a facility can not be
14 accessed, it will not be utilized, adding that this access includes the road getting
15 there. He expressed disagreement with Policy Choice No. 9, noting that he often
16 misses a driveway and has to access the next driveway and backtrack. He
17 expressed his agreement with earlier comments on Policy Choices No. 10 and 11.

18
19 Observing that he had only received this information today, Commissioner Lynott
20 informed Chairman Maks that he does not feel prepared to discuss these issues.

21
22 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Lynott that this is only a work session and she
23 would be happy to accept any e-mail comments that he submits to her.

24
25 Chairman Maks expressed his opinion that it appears to be the overall consensus
26 to create a TOD of some fashion, adding that this particular TOD will not
27 resemble any of the existing TODs or their intents, because of the existing land
28 uses.

29
30 On question, Ms. Fryer advised Chairman Maks that because this is a work
31 session, rather than a Public Hearing, a continuance is not necessary, adding that
32 she expects to return in January 2001, or possibly later, to address this issue again.

33
34 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

35
36 Minutes of the meeting of October 4, 2000, submitted. Commissioner Dunham
37 referred to Mr. Lynch's comments, requesting that lines 33 and 34 of page 14 be
38 amended, as follows: "He pointed out that ~~neither Chapter 3 nor Chapter 4~~ of
39 Technical Document No. 2 was **not** included with these documents."
40 Commissioner Voytilla **MOVED** and Commissioner Barnard **SECONDED** a
41 motion that the minutes be approved, as amended.

42
43 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously, with the exception of Commissioners Dunham
44 and Lynott, who abstained from voting on this issue.

45
46 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

1 Commissioner Barnard referred to the Murray Scholls Town Center turn lane,
2 noting that the south side of Murray Road intersection adjusts from two lanes to
3 one lane because it is blocked on the right-hand lane due to the turn lane of
4 Scholls Ferry Road onto Murray Boulevard. He emphasized that the Planning
5 Commission had been assured that the right-hand lane of Murray Boulevard
6 would be changed from a straight on road to a right-turn only onto Scholls Ferry
7 Road.

8

9 Chairman Maks questioned whether Commissioner Barnard is referring to the
10 original application or the modification.

11

12 Commissioner Barnard advised Chairman Maks that he is referring to the
13 modification.

14

15 Observing that this road is actually a Washington County facility, Chairman Maks
16 suggested that Commissioner Barnard discuss his concerns with City
17 Transportation Engineer Randy Wooley.

18

19 The meeting adjourned at 9:28 p.m.